



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,614	07/28/2003	Roger Y. B. Young	03-0460	4439
47384 7590 02/23/2009 RYAN, MASON & LEWIS, LLP 90 FOREST AVENUE LOCUST VALLEY, NY 11560				
EXAMINER				
LE, QUE TAN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2878				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/23/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

*Ex parte* ROGER Y. B. YOUNG, JOHN A. KNOCH,  
and JASON W. MCNICHOLS

---

Appeal 2008-5124  
Application 10/628,614  
Technology Center 2800

---

Decided: February 23, 2009

---

Before BRADLEY R. GARRIS, CATHERINE Q. TIMM, and  
JEFFREY B. ROBERTSON, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

GARRIS, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

REMAND TO THE EXAMINER

We remand this application to the jurisdiction of the Examining Corps so that the Examiner can take necessary action consistent with our comments below.

Appellants' Appeal Brief (filed Apr. 11, 2006; "Br.") and the Amended Appeal Brief (filed Sept. 10, 2007; "Amended Br.") are defective for two reasons.

First, although independent claim 2 is expressly appealed (Br. 4) and is reproduced in the Claims Appendix (Br. 19), the pending § 103 rejection of claim 2 has not been argued (Br. 12-15) or even acknowledged (Br. 10). These circumstances suggest that Appellants have failed to argue appealed independent claim 2 by unintentional oversight. Appellants must be notified of this apparent oversight and given an opportunity to either argue the rejection of independent claim 2 or withdraw the appeal of this claim.

Second, neither the Appeal Brief nor the Amended Appeal Brief complies with 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(v) *Summary of claimed subject matter*. As background, Appellants were notified that the Appeal Brief is defective in failing to comply with this regulation. (See the "Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief" mailed Aug. 8, 2007.) Appellants attempted to cure this defect by filing the Amended Appeal Brief which contains an "Amended Summary of claimed subject matter". However, this Amended Summary also fails to comply with the regulation under consideration. This is because the Amended Summary recites embodiments disclosed in the Specification without relating these embodiments to "the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal" (§ 41.37 (c)(1)(v)). In addition, we observe that many of the independent and dependent method claims on appeal have been separately argued, but that the Amended Summary does not identify every step plus function in these claims and correspondingly does not identify "the structure, material, or acts

described in the specification as corresponding to each claimed function”  
(*id.*).

In response to this Remand, the Examiner must notify Appellants of the Appeal Brief and Amended Appeal Brief defects discussed above and provide Appellants with an opportunity to file a new Amended Appeal Brief in order to cure these defects. (*See* the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 1205.03(Rev. 3, Aug. 2005)). If the new Amended Appeal Brief includes argument directed to the pending § 103 rejection of independent claim 2, the new Brief must completely replace the previously filed Briefs, and the Examiner must issue a Supplemental Answer responding to the claim 2 arguments. (*Id.*).

#### REMANDED

ssl

RYAN, MASON & LEWIS, L.L.P.  
90 FOREST AVENUE  
LOCUST VALLEY, NY 11560